

JANUARY 26, 2005

**Exhibit 3**

# **USER FEE ANALYSIS - PHASE ONE**

## **CITY OF LONG BEACH**

**JANUARY 26, 2005**

**PRM**

**PUBLIC RESOURCE MANAGEMENT GROUP**

1380 Lead Hill Blvd., Suite 106, Roseville, CA 95661

tel 916-677-4233 fax 916-677-2283 [www.prmgroup.net](http://www.prmgroup.net)

PROVIDING PROFESSIONAL SERVICES TO GOVERNMENT

## INTRODUCTION

---

The City of Long Beach engaged PRM to review its general fund user fees and charges. This study is an important step toward achieving the City's Three-Year Financial Strategic Plan goals. PRM is charged with determining the full cost of fee related services and providing the City with information regarding best practices and industry conventions.

This report presents Phase One of our study, which focuses on a selective number of service areas with significant revenue opportunity. The objective of the Phase One report is to provide the City with a high level "gap analysis" of program cost, current fee revenue and the resulting general fund subsidy. At the conclusion of Phase One, the City Council could decide whether and how much to subsidize the services reviewed.

By way of background, it is important to note that most user fee increases are limited by the California Constitution, court decisions and certain sections of the Government Code Regulations. The ones identified having a particular relevance are listed below and detailed in Exhibit A.

- Proposition 13 & 62;
- Proposition 218;
- California Constitution, Article XIII D, section 6 (amended by Proposition 218);
- Apartment Assoc. of Los Angeles County, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (2001) Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 830, California Supreme Court affecting application of Prop. 218;
- State Government Code (GC) 66014
- State Health and Safety Code 17950 and 17951
- State Government Code (GC) 36900 is presented as the City considers revising its municipal codes in regards to code enforcement activities.
- California Attorney General's Opinion (No. 92-506, March 9, 1993) provides a legal description regarding appropriate building permit fees.

It should be noted that PRM does not specialize in municipal law. For this reason, it is suggested that the City direct questions regarding the text referenced above and its application to legal counsel. The City should ensure that it adequately interprets applicable laws and court decisions for its specific circumstances.

The legal summary above does not include references to taxes, assessments nor utility-related fees, such as water or refuse.

## Phase One Analysis

The first phase of our study was designed to increase fees that are significantly below "estimated reasonable costs" as defined by State Government Code 66014 and where an increase would yield significant additional revenue.

### Methodology

1. Macro Gap Analysis – PRM compared the full "business cost" of select fee-related programs to current revenues. Business cost includes three cost layers: 1) direct – the cost of staff, vehicles, supplies, etc. involved with service provision, 2) departmental indirect – the cost of supervision and administration, and 3) citywide overhead – an allocated share of costs from citywide internal support departments.

This gap analysis established which fees could be increased without exceeding "estimated reasonable costs" – the legal ceiling imposed by State law.

2. Benchmark Analysis – in some cases comparisons of City's fees were conducted to neighboring jurisdictions.
3. Discussion with departmental staff – numerous meetings were held with City staff to discuss the economic and social impact of new fees and fee increases.

### Opportunities

Our Phase One analysis found significant revenue opportunities. A summary discussion of the opportunities including fee comparisons with other jurisdictions follows in this report in Appendix B, which provides specific fee/revenue opportunities identified by PRM totaling \$981,145. The range of fee revenue opportunities that could be considered is from \$431,848 to \$1,748,288 and is reflected in the Summary of Findings Table on page 5.

The upper end of the range represents what can be achieved if fees are increased (or instituted) to equal "estimated reasonable costs". The City Council must decide how much of the various services to subsidize. PRM recommends that a prudent level of revenue increase would fall somewhere within this range – and that the City Council be somewhat conservative with fee increases in consideration of the time it will take for the more detailed Phase Two analysis to be completed.

## Phase Two Analysis

The second phase of our study is designed to review fees on an individual basis. Developer impact fees will not be covered by this study. Phase Two will establish a methodology to quantify costs of service delivery related to each fee. The City will be able to use such a methodology when setting and adjusting fees or service levels related to those fees.

When finished, this report will provide a thorough description of all layers of costs that tie into a defined and defensible methodology.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

---

The following table summarizes the results of PRM's high-level analysis of costs and revenues and estimates a range of revenue opportunities. Please note that specific Fee Recommendations are listed in Appendix B. Each column of the summary table is defined below:

- 2003/04 Full Cost – these figures reflect the full business cost of each Division/Bureau, including fiscal 2004 budget appropriations, departmental indirect cost, and Citywide indirect cost.
- Full Cost – Fee Related Programs Only – this column only includes costs for which fees may be charged.
- 2003/04 Fee Revenue – this column reflects budgeted fiscal year 2004 fee revenues.
- Fee Related Subsidy – This column shows the gap between costs and revenues. Positive figures reflect the amount the City subsidizes program costs. In other words, the amount that fee-related costs are not recovered through fees. It is important to note that this amount also represents the ceiling of additional fee-revenue opportunity. Negative figures in this column reflect the lack of such subsidy and a net revenue surplus.
- Additional Revenue Range – these columns project additional revenues that could be generated under a conservative approach and an aggressive approach. The recommend column matches with Fee Recommendations found in Appendix B.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS TABLE

Department/Program	2003/04 Full Cost	Full Cost - Fee Related Pgms Only	2003/04 Fee Revenue <sup>1</sup>	Fee Related Subsidy	Additional Revenue Range		
					Conservative	Recommend	Aggressive
Environmental Health Non-Code Enf. <sup>2</sup>	\$1,090,969	\$514,861	\$503,180	\$11,681	\$0	\$0	\$242,000
Fire Prevention <sup>3</sup>	\$2,262,113	\$1,323,045	\$1,175,534	\$147,511	\$0	\$0	\$22,600
Planning & Building Building Bureau <sup>4</sup>	\$6,135,915	\$6,135,915	\$8,076,933	(\$1,941,018)	\$0	\$0	\$0
Commission Bureau	\$56,980	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Planning Bureau	\$3,459,528	\$3,228,176	\$1,425,349	\$1,802,827	\$100,000	\$507,000	\$507,000
Code Enforcement							
Planning & Building	\$3,539,595	\$2,883,432	\$1,454,535	\$1,428,897	\$142,890	\$165,000	\$428,669
Environmental	\$4,320,105	\$4,320,105	\$3,230,524	\$1,089,581	\$88,000	\$88,000	\$326,874
Health	\$1,148,369	\$1,148,369	\$1,060,500	\$87,869	\$80,000	\$221,145	\$221,145
Fire							
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$22,013,574</b>	<b>\$19,553,902</b>	<b>\$16,976,415</b>	<b>\$2,577,487</b>	<b>\$431,848</b>	<b>\$981,145</b>	<b>\$1,748,288</b>

1. 2003/04 Fee Revenues are based on budgeted 2003/04 revenues as of July 2004.

2. Aggressive fee revenue is related to Vector Control subsidy explained below.

3. Although we did not analyze Fire Suppression, we note two fee opportunities for that division: \$20,000 for DUI billing & \$20,000 for false alarm fee.

4. Amount shown is extrapolated revenue for a full year based on 9 months. Actual 2003/04 non Code Enforcement building revenue was \$8,126,793.

Under typical construction activity, building fees would have generated approximately \$6,019,000.

Note: These figures reflect the FY 2003/04 City structure and do not project or predict future structures. Also, cost estimates presented in this report do not reflect recently negotiated employee pension cost increases, currently at approximately 24% for Public Safety payroll and 15% for non-Safety personnel payroll; however, these do reflect the full cost of service which includes departmental costs and citywide overhead costs.

## Environmental Health

The City's Environmental Health functions were analyzed by first segregating the functions as Code Enforcement related or other Environmental Health Bureau related services. The Code Enforcement services within Environmental Health are shown in the Code Enforcement section in the above chart. The Environmental Health category above is further divided into "user fee" related services and "non-user fee" related services.

Two programs, Water Quality and Lead Hazard Reduction, are budgeted to cost \$514,861. These two programs are almost fully cost recovered through user fees and no additional revenue opportunities exist. They represent about 50% of the non-Code Enforcement Environmental Health Bureau's costs, which total \$1,090,969.

This Bureau is also responsible for Vector Control within certain geographical areas of the city. While not eligible to be a user-fee supported service, there is potential to reduce the subsidy of this program if the current agreement with the Water Department were amended to more fully support costs. The gap analysis shows that costs exceeded revenues from the Water Fund by \$242,195. Appendix C has additional discussion of subsidy levels and other possible funding mechanisms within Vector Control.

## Fire Prevention

The City generally recovers its Fire Prevention program costs. The City's fire plan check fee was recently increased to more fully recover costs and is one of the highest fees in comparison to other cities. Consequently, there are not as many opportunities as we would find in a typical Fire Prevention operation. We estimate the Fire Prevention division could generate another \$22,600 by raising the plan check fee to 77% of Building's plan check fee. This new percentage fee would recover 100% of the Fire plan check program.

In addition, while not typically considered "user fee services" other potential areas for general fund cost recovery are: 1) arson investigation and 2) hazardous materials cleanup, as discussed below.

The City could reduce its \$685,997 subsidy of the Arson Investigation program by charging cost recovery hourly rates against convicted arsonists. PRM's experience and research indicates the likely impact on revenues from such cost recovery charges may be slight because it is difficult to

identify those who set fires. Fire staff suggests there may also be an opportunity to recover a portion of these costs from insurance companies, since identification of arson activities benefits insurance companies. They stated that in some instances investigators from insurance companies use information gathered by Fire Arson Investigators to solve cases. Although no other jurisdiction was identified that charges a fee to insurance companies for arson investigation, insurance companies may be a new funding source to explore to recover costs for arson services.

A revenue opportunity may also exist to fund hazardous materials cleanup costs by increasing hazardous waste generator permit fees. The Long Beach Fire Department is the first responder to spills of toxic or unknown substances. The challenge to increasing hazardous waste generator permit fees would be to establish a defensible connection to services. Staff indicates that the accidents they respond to are rarely local hazardous waste generators. For this reason, such a fee may be challenged.

Although we did not analyze the Fire Department's Suppression Division as part of this phase, two potential fees were brought to our attention within this division: driving while intoxicated accident response and false alarm response. These two fees are discussed in Appendix D. These fees will be further analyzed in Phase 2 of our study.

## Planning and Building

### Building

Our analysis focused on the traditional functions of a building operation: plan review, construction inspection and permit issuance. To achieve this focus, we separated out the Code Enforcement Section of the Inspection Services Division into its own section of this report. The budget units analyzed include:

1. Operations and Support Division— provides counter support and issues permits.
2. Engineering Services Division — reviews construction plans for adherence to building codes and specifies conditions of approval.
3. Construction Inspection Section — performs on-site inspection of construction projects for adherence to approved building plans.

Our analysis found little if any revenue opportunity. Building revenue in fiscal year 2003 reached unprecedented levels due to unusually high construction activity. However, when determining the appropriateness of building user fees it is necessary to first project revenues assuming "normalized" construction activity. Using this methodology, Building costs of \$6,135,915 are almost exactly offset by revenues, leaving only 2% of costs unrecovered (prior to PERS cost increases).

## Planning

PRM reviewed the Planning and Building Department's Planning Bureau budgeted revenues by extrapolating 2003/04 actual year-to-date figures and found the differences insignificant. Accordingly, our revenue figures reflect budget for fiscal year 2004. Below are the primary findings by program area:

Within Land Use (PB12-15) there is no subsidy for this \$1,192,732 program. For this reason, PRM recommends no adjustments to Land Use at this time.

Community Planning (PB09) costs the City \$362,392. Planning staff estimate 60 percent of community planning meetings are directly related to private development applications. PRM recommends either institution of new fees to recover these costs or that existing planning applications be increased to fund the 60 percent of the costs, or \$217,000. As part of Phase Two, PRM will work with Planning and Building staff to quantify staff activity related to development and recommend reasonable cost recovery levels.

Lastly, Advanced Planning (PB3-7) subsidies should be reduced by increasing the General Plan surcharge by approximately \$125,000 to \$200,000 as discussed below.

PRM recommends the following existing surcharges used to pay for services be increased or retained at adjusted levels:

Increase General Plan Surcharge – The City funds staff to maintain the General Plan through a 1.5% surcharge on all building permits. Most cities that assess a surcharge also fund the cost of the general plan update as well. A General Plan update for the City of Long Beach might cost between \$1,250,000 and \$2,000,000. General plans are typically useful for 10 years, resulting in an unfunded cost of \$125,000 to \$200,000 annually. PRM recommends that the City increase its General Plan Surcharge to include these costs. It is estimated that if a higher surcharge were applied to the same types of permits as the current surcharge, this surcharge would have to be raised from the current 1.5% to anywhere from 3.0% up to 3.76%. This estimated percentage increase is based on FY 2003 development revenues and it makes no adjustments for changes in construction activity. To generate an additional \$150,000, the amount presented in the summary table of revenue recommendations, the surcharge is estimated at 3.2%.

By comparison, the City of Riverside charges a 10% surcharge against all development revenue to fund its General Plan, while Morgan Hill charges 5% against all development revenue. Further comparison is difficult because most cities have very different fee structures. For example, the



City of Garden Grove charges a flat fee of \$2 plus \$1.75 per \$1,000 of construction valuation; to fund its General Plan.

Charge Technology Surcharge indefinitely – The City's 5% technology surcharge, which was adopted to fund a new permit tracking system, was slated to sunset in December of 2004. It is our understanding that the City is in the process of extending this surcharge for an additional three years to cover acquisition and installation costs. Most jurisdictions find that they incur significant costs after the purchase, such as maintenance and upgrades. The City of San Jose recently re-imposed this surcharge two years after the initial purchase of their software systems.

After acquisition and installation costs are recovered, we recommend the City maintain this fee indefinitely to recover ongoing costs at a reduced percentage. The City has not yet selected the software program it wants to purchase. For this reason, specific dollar amounts for licensing and maintenance are not available. At this time, PRM estimates the City should plan for the surcharge to recover \$140,000 annually. If the surcharge is applied to the same level of development revenues it is estimated to have to be set at 1.3% to generate \$140,000.

In Phase Two of this study, PRM will evaluate Environmental Planning Fees and will research options to recoup Historic Preservation program costs as requested by the Planning and Building Department.

## Code Enforcement

As requested PRM met with Management Partners and Community Development staff to review projected revenues to ensure these were within cost recovery levels. Management Partners' revenue estimates are summarized below.

### Management Partner's Additional Revenue Estimate

Management Partners Code Enforcement Projected Full Cost Recovery Amounts  
Submitted 7/9/04

City Department	Inspection/Type	04 Budget	Projected 10% Cost Recovery
Health	Housing Inspection Program	\$1,154,275	\$115,428
Health	Hazardous Waste Generator Inspections	\$1,216,000	\$121,600
Fire	Fire Prevention Bureau Inspections	\$631,275	\$63,128
		<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$300,155</b>

PRM identified that fee-related Code Enforcement programs are subsidized by approximately \$2.6 million per year, prior to any organizational changes. Therefore, the \$300,155 revenue estimated in the first year is well under the cost recovery threshold. It should be noted that organizational and personnel classification changes will affect the Fee-

related Subsidy. The later part of Phase Two will review the Fee Subsidy amounts as the City's final code enforcement model is implemented.

Planning and Building – PRM anticipates significant revenue can be generated by implementing an aggressive fee schedule and by adopting a noticing policy, similar to that employed by the County of Sacramento (Appendix E).

A re-inspection fee is a code enforcement method that encourages corrective action by penalizing those who do not take corrective action within a reasonable time; PRM estimates that establishing a re-inspection fee within the City's code enforcement program would generate approximately \$50,000. Code enforcement staff is working on quantifying existing re-inspection activity levels to further refine this estimate.

The City's Code Enforcement Transition Team is working on a new model of code enforcement. Among its new tools may be a citation to enforce zoning, vehicle and building code enforcement violations. A similar citation system is also being considered to specifically enforce conditional and administrative use permits.

By instituting new fees, PRM estimates a 30% revenue increase is achievable within Planning and Building Code Enforcement, increasing revenue from \$1,454,535 to \$1,883,204, an additional \$428,669.

State funds for abatement of abandoned vehicles are available under the Vehicle Code 9250.7 for Counties that establish a Service Authority to undertake this service. Those participating cities within the County can then obtain funds by participating in the respective County Service Authority's program. A \$1 annual fee on vehicle registrations collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles funds these programs.

As described in Vehicle Code 22710, the county board of supervisors may establish such a service authority with a two-thirds vote along with a majority vote from a majority of cities having a majority of the population in incorporated areas. All participating legislative bodies must adopt resolutions to establish the authority and impose the fee. Long Beach will need to consider whether this is a viable option to explore with Los Angeles County.

Environmental Health – Within the Environmental Code Enforcement Bureau is a subsidy of \$570,508 in the Hazardous Waste program (HE0613). Both the Health and Fire Departments work on the City's CUPA program and collect fees. CUPA warrants further attention among these two departments. PRM estimates a cost recovery opportunity of \$59,000 in the Health Department, given that Health staff identified they undertake more annual inspections per waste generator than the City of Los Angeles. Staff noted this is an effective method of reducing hazmat incidences. Phase Two will quantify overall CUPA activity to identify if the

fee structure for both departments is commensurate with the cost of services rendered.

An additional \$139,000 subsidy is found within the City's existing Housing Inspections program (HE0611), corroborating the figures provided by Management Partners in the City's Code Enforcement Study. Since this initial calculation, the City has increased this fee. The Health Department staff has estimated this increase to generate an additional \$110,000 based on a 10% increase. Therefore, a nominal opportunity remains to increase such housing inspection fees by the remaining subsidy amount of \$29,000.

In total, it is estimated that \$326,874 of additional revenue is achievable within Environmental Health Bureau's Code Enforcement activities.

Fire Prevention - Recalculation of Tridata/PFM recommendations – In the appendix of the Fire Services Review conducted by Tridata/PFM, a detailed analysis of Fire Prevention fees is presented. This analysis arrives at the cost of each fee-related service by multiplying average time requirements by \$55 per hour. This hourly rate, however, does not include citywide indirect cost, departmental administration or materials and supplies. PRM calculated the full hourly rate at \$78 per hour. Applying this rate to the nine most active fees yields \$221,145 extra revenue potential. This revenue could be used to cover the current subsidy within Code Enforcement. See details below:

#### Recalculation of Select PFM Fee Recommendations

Fee Service	# of Permits and/or Inspections FY 2002/03	Annual Service Cost Calculated @ \$55/hr	Annual Service Cost Calculated @ \$78/hr	Additional Revenue Potential @ full cost rate
General Use Permit and Certificates	747	\$143,798	\$203,931	\$60,134
Places of Assembly - A-3	555	\$106,838	\$151,515	\$44,678
Garages - Motor Vehicle Repair	387	\$74,498	\$105,651	\$31,154
Fire Clearance - R-3	267	\$51,398	\$72,891	\$21,494
High Rise Building	70	\$48,125	\$68,250	\$20,125
Places of Assembly - A-2.1 300 load	113	\$34,183	\$48,477	\$14,295
Flammable Finishes	114	\$28,215	\$40,014	\$11,799
Inside storage < 60 gallons	112	\$21,560	\$30,576	\$9,016
Liquid Gases, > 120 gallons	98	\$20,213	\$28,665	\$8,453
	2,463	\$528,825	\$749,970	\$221,145

#### Fire False Alarm Fees – Comments on Tridata/PFM Revenue Recommendations

Initially, PRM was considering recommending fire false alarm fees as a potential new substantial revenue source. However, Fire Suppression management commented that Fire staff works with abusers of repeat fire false alarms to educate and develop methods to lower the number of false

alarms. Fire staff commented that a fee that is too high might deter necessary fire alarm systems that enable fires to be detected at an early stage. PRM recommends that caution be used when extrapolating fee revenue in this area. PRM notes that Fresno is similar in size to Long Beach and only generates approximately \$25,000 annually from their fire false alarm fee.

Alarm permits and false alarm fees were not part of Phase One. False alarm fees are billed for excessive Police Department responses. City staff is moving forward with implementing increased fees in this area. The Police Department's fees and charges will be analyzed in Phase Two of the Fee Study. Alarm permits will also be further researched and reported in Phase Two. The Fire Department currently does not receive revenues for false alarms. Information presented in Phase Two will supplement reports submitted to the Budget Oversight Committee on these issues.

#### Oil Well Code Enforcement – Comments on Cost Recovery

PRM did not find opportunities for cost recovery within the Planning and Building Department's oil well code enforcement program. As part of Phase Two, a survey of activities will be reviewed in this area to ensure that the City has identified all the activities and time spent in this program area.

City staff in Planning and Building has indicated that the combination of such fees appears to be comparable to those collected in other jurisdictions when reviewed in the aggregate. The City may need to reconsider how to allocate resources to ensure that services rendered are comparable to revenues collected within this program area.

## APPENDIX A – APPLICABLE PROPOSITIONS, CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION EXCERPTS, CASE LAW AND GOVERNMENTS CODES

---

Below is a description of state law, case law and government codes affecting municipal law parameters identified as being of particular importance to the establishment, modification and administration of user fees and/or code enforcement relate fees or violations:

- Propositions 13 & 62 – Proposition 13 capped the property tax and required a two-thirds popular vote for any tax whose proceeds were designated in advance for a particular use. Most public counsel concludes that charter cities are exempt from Proposition 62. A later proposition, Proposition 218, added some rules of Proposition 62 to the State Constitution and adversely affected charter cities. It made the voter approval for general taxes applicable to charter cities for taxes imposed after January 1, 1995. A few court cases have unsuccessfully challenged the application of Proposition 62 and 218 to charter cities prior to this date. Cities were allowed to ratify taxes prior to November 6, 1996 for existing taxes adopted between January 1, 1995 and November 5, 1996; these are referred to as the “window period.”
- Proposition 218 – The intent of Proposition 218 in regards to fees was to deter local governments from re-labeling taxes or assessments as fees to evade the measure’s detailed requirements. Proposition 218 fee provisions were hastily drafted and efforts to attain legislative clarification of their terms have not been possible according to Colantuono, Levin & Rozell. The Colantuono, et. al. document, entitled The Law of Municipal Revenues: An Update on Proposition 62 & 218 (October 4, 2002), is posted on the League of California Cities’ website.

Relevant portions of Proposition 218 state that property-related fees or charges require a vote of the electorate. This means such a fee or charge be “upon a parcel” or “upon a person as an incident of property ownership”. Fees or charges imposed on a fee-for-service basis are generally excluded. Ultimately, the courts will define what constitutes property-“relatedness” under this proposition.

Property-related fees or charges are to be in compliance with the California Constitution, Article XIII D, section 6 (see excerpt below). New or increased property-related fees and charges require a public vote, see section 6 (c) of the same article. Exempted fees or charges from the vote requirement are specified as sewer, water and refuse. Cities were to comply with these requirements by July 1, 1997. Fees and charges are exempt from Proposition 218 section 6 (c), if: 1) the fee or charge is a condition of property development; 2) not property-related; or 3) these are for electrical or gas service.

California Constitution, Article XIII D, section 6 (b) lists the requirements to extend, impose or increase property-related fees and charges. Under this section, fees and charges: 1) are not exceed the cost of providing the service; 2) are to be used only for the purpose that the fee or charge was imposed; 3) amounts upon a parcel or person as

incident of property ownership are not to exceed the proportional cost of the service attributable to the parcel; 4) based on potential or future use are not permitted. The service must be actually used or immediately available to the affected property owner; and, 5) are not to be imposed for general governmental services, such as police, fire, ambulance or library services. This restriction applies to services that are available to the public at large in substantially the same manner. In a legal action contesting such a fee or charge, the burden lies with the city to demonstrate compliance.

- *Apartment Assoc. of Los Angeles County, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (2001) Cal. 4<sup>th</sup> 830 provides a California Supreme Court decision that narrows the application of Proposition 218 as it relates to regulatory fees. The decision involved a \$12 per year fee on residential landlords in Los Angeles to recoup the cost of housing enforcement and slum abatement programs. The court found this inspection fee to be more comparable to a business license than a charge against a property.

The court decided that this inspection fee is not imposed solely because a person owns the property; it is imposed only on those landowners who choose to engage in the residential rental business, and only while they are operating the business. Also, if a city enforces payment of such a fee by placing a lien on the property, it does not make the fee property-related. This type of collection is seen as the city simply accessing a means to collect the fee.

Proposition 218 provisions are limited to fees imposed on property ownership and do not extend to fees imposed on a voluntary use of property. If a fee can be avoided without selling the property, the fee should be outside the parameters of Proposition 218.

- State Government Code (GC) 66014 – specifically states that development user fees, such as zoning variances, plan checks, permits and building inspections, must not exceed the “estimated reasonable cost” to provide a service. These fees may include reasonable costs to prepare and revise the plans and policies that require adoption to make any necessary findings and determinations. With a two-thirds voter approval, such fees may exceed reasonable costs.
- State Health and Safety Code 17950 and 17951 (code enforcement fees) - These provisions relate to apartment houses, hotels, motels, dwellings, buildings and structures. The city may prescribe fees for permits, certificates or other documents and to defray costs for code enforcement. These fees shall not exceed the reasonable amount required to administer, process or carry out such activities. Section 17951 (c) specifies that such fees must not be levied for general revenue purposes.
- State Government Code (GC) 36900 – Establishes violations of city ordinances as misdemeanors, unless by ordinance they are made an infraction. This code establishes amounts of fines for violations. As the City considers recommendations from its Code Enforcement Study, this code is being reviewed as manner of revising its municipal code ordinance by in regards to certain code enforcement violations. (See specifics of case law at the end of Appendix A.)

- California Attorney General's Opinion (No. 92-506, March 9, 1993) – provides the clearest legal description regarding appropriate building permit fees. This Opinion concluded:
  - A local agency is prohibited from charging building permit and similar fees, which exceed the estimated reasonable costs of providing the services, rendered unless the amounts of the fees are approved by the electorate.
  - A local agency may not charge building permit and similar fees based upon the Uniform Building Code Valuation Tables, which are in excess of the estimated reasonable costs of providing the services rendered unless the amounts of the fees are approved by the electorate.
  - If a local agency charges building permit and similar fees based upon the Uniform Building Code Valuation Tables without supporting evidence regarding the relationship between the fees and the services rendered, such fees are invalid to the extent they exceed the reasonable costs of providing the services rendered.

Excerpt from State Constitution Article XIII D, Section 6

CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE 13D (ASSESSMENT AND PROPERTY-RELATED FEE REFORM)

SEC. 6. Property Related Fees and Charges. (a) Procedures for New or Increased Fees and Charges. An agency shall follow the procedures pursuant to this section in imposing or increasing any fee or charge as defined pursuant to this article, including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) The parcels upon which a fee or charge is proposed for imposition shall be identified. The amount of the fee or charge proposed to be imposed upon each parcel shall be calculated. The agency shall provide written notice by mail of the proposed fee or charge to the record owner of each identified parcel upon which the fee or charge is proposed for imposition, the amount of the fee or charge proposed to be imposed upon each, the basis upon which the amount of the proposed fee or charge was calculated, the reason for the fee or charge, together with the date, time, and location of a public hearing on the proposed fee or charge.

(2) The agency shall conduct a public hearing upon the proposed fee or charge not less than 45 days after mailing the notice of the proposed fee or charge to the record owners of each identified parcel upon which the fee or charge is proposed for imposition. At the public hearing, the agency shall consider all protests against the proposed fee or charge. If written protests against the proposed fee or charge are presented by a majority of owners of the identified parcels, the agency shall not impose the fee or charge.

(b) Requirements for Existing, New or Increased Fees and Charges. A fee or charge shall not be extended, imposed, or increased by any agency unless it meets all of the following requirements:

(1) Revenues derived from the fee or charge shall not exceed the funds required to provide the property related service.

(2) Revenues derived from the fee or charge shall not be used for any purpose other than that for which the fee or charge was imposed.

(3) The amount of a fee or charge imposed upon any parcel or



person as an incident of property ownership shall not exceed the proportional cost of the service attributable to the parcel.

(4) No fee or charge may be imposed for a service unless that service is actually used by, or immediately available to, the owner of the property in question. Fees or charges based on potential or future use of a service are not permitted. Standby charges, whether characterized as charges or assessments, shall be classified as assessments and shall not be imposed without compliance with Section 4.

(5) No fee or charge may be imposed for general governmental services including, but not limited to, police, fire, ambulance or library services, where the service is available to the public at large in substantially the same manner as it is to property owners. Reliance by an agency on any parcel map, including, but not limited to, an assessor's parcel map, may be considered a significant factor in determining whether a fee or charge is imposed as an incident of property ownership for purposes of this article. In any legal action contesting the validity of a fee or charge, the burden shall be on the agency to demonstrate compliance with this article.

(c) Voter Approval for New or Increased Fees and Charges. Except for fees or charges for sewer, water, and refuse collection services, no property related fee or charge shall be imposed or increased unless and until that fee or charge is submitted and approved by a majority vote of the property owners of the property subject to the fee or charge or, at the option of the agency, by a two-thirds vote of the electorate residing in the affected area. The election shall be conducted not less than 45 days after the public hearing. An agency may adopt procedures similar to those for increases in assessments in the conduct of elections under this subdivision.

(d) Beginning July 1, 1997, all fees or charges shall comply with this section.

CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE, SECTION 36900-36904

36900. (a) Violation of a city ordinance is a misdemeanor unless by ordinance it is made an infraction. The violation of a city ordinance may be prosecuted by city authorities in the name of the people of the State of California, or redressed by civil action.

(b) Every violation determined to be an infraction is punishable by (1) a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars (\$100) for a first violation; (2) a fine not exceeding two hundred dollars (\$200) for a second violation of the same ordinance within one year; (3) a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars (\$500) for each additional violation of the same ordinance within one year.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a violation of local building and safety codes determined to be an infraction is punishable by (1) a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars (\$100) for a first violation; (2) a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars (\$500) for a second violation of the same ordinance within one year; (3) a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each additional violation of the same ordinance within one year of the first violation.

36901. The city legislative body may impose fines, penalties, and forfeitures for violations of ordinances. It may fix the penalty by fine or imprisonment, or both. A fine shall not exceed one thousand dollars (\$1,000). Imprisonment shall not exceed six months.

36903. Imprisonment for violation of an ordinance shall be in the city jail, unless by ordinance the legislative body prescribes imprisonment in the county jail. If city prisoners are imprisoned in the county jail the expense is a charge against the city.

36904. The legislative body may require persons imprisoned for violation of an ordinance to labor on public property or works within the city.

## **APPENDIX B – FEE REVENUE OPPORTUNITY**

---

## KEY

A - AUGUST 2

B - PROPOSED BUDGET

C - STILL WORKING ON

I - IMPLEMENTED

January 26, 2005

Fee/Revenue Opportunity	Dept/Bureau	New or Modified	Fee Structure	Projected Revenue Increase	
<b>Gent Plan Update Fee</b>	<b>Planning</b>	<b>Modified</b>	<b>Various</b>	<b>\$150,000</b>	<b>A</b>
<i>This fee should be increased to fund the consultant fee, which is estimated to be approximately \$1,500,000 every 10 years. The current surcharge of 1.5% would be raised to 3.2%. This assumes the same development levels would continue to be assessed the General Plan surcharge.</i>					
Long Beach (current): 1.5% of development fee revenue					
Garden Grove	\$1.75 per \$1,000 of construction valuation	Oakland	\$1 per \$1,000 of construction valuation		
Lakewood	\$0.85 per \$1,000 of construction valuation	Riverside	10% of development fee revenue		
San Diego	\$84 per plan check	Sacramento	\$0.56 per \$1,000 of construction valuation		
Stockton	\$1 per \$1,000 of construction valuation				
<b>Technology Surcharge</b>	<b>Planning</b>	<b>Modified</b>	<b>% of Dee Fee</b>	<b>\$140,000</b>	<b>A</b>
<i>This surcharge is currently set to purchase the City's development permit tracking software, and it was scheduled to sunset in December 2004. The City is processing an extension to cover acquisition and installation costs. This surcharge should be continued at a reduced percentage to fund ongoing costs including maintenance agreements, upgrades and operations. An estimated 1.3% surcharge would raise the proposed amount on a continual basis. This estimate assumes the same development revenues would continue to be assessed the Technology surcharge.</i>					
Long Beach (=real); 5% of development fee revenue					
Huntington Beach	2.2% of development fee revenue	Berkeley	5% of building permit revenue		
Irvine	5% of building permit revenue	Sacramento	4% of development fee revenue		
<b>Planning Applications</b>	<b>Planning</b>	<b>Modified or New</b>	<b>Various</b>	<b>\$217,000</b>	<b>C</b>
<i>Approximately 60% of community planning meetings, or \$217,000, are directly related to private development projects. Currently these meetings are conducted free of charge. We recommend three methods to recover these costs: 1) institute a new fee, 2) increase all planning applications by a percentage, or 3) obtain Redevelopment or CDBG funding.</i>					
Long Beach (current): No Fee or Surcharge Applied -					
Pasadena	Fees include standard cost for 3 meetings estimated at approximately \$3,000	Berkeley San Jose	15% surcharge on specific application types 1st free, \$570 per meeting thereafter		
San Diego	8% administrative charge on development impact fees covers meetings & other general administrative activities & staff				
<b>Code Re-inspection Fees</b>	<b>Code Enf.- Planning</b>	<b>New</b>	<b>Flat \$120</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>I</b>
<i>We recommend the City institute a \$120 reinspection fee for code compliance violations. We estimate this fee will generate approximately \$50,000 per year.</i>				<b>\$35,000</b>	
Long Beach (current): \$30 reinspection fee to deter calls for inspections prior to work completion					
<i>Note: Code enforcement fees under review as part of reengineering process</i>					
Anaheim	\$222 per hour after second inspection	Oakland	Residential \$73; Others \$280		
Lakewood	\$30 for excessive re-inspections	Sacramento	\$150		
San Diego	\$98	Berkeley	\$125		
<b>Weed Abatement Admin Fee</b>	<b>Code Enf.- Planning</b>	<b>New</b>	<b>% of Contract</b>		<b>A</b>
<i>When a property is in violation of the weed ordinance the City contracts with a private landscape contractor to cut the weeds. The City pays the contractor and collects this amount from the property owner. Most cities add an administrative fee to the bill, but Long Beach does not. We recommend the City institute a 50% administrative charge. This policy should generate approximately \$35,000 per year, taking into consideration a reduced number of violations in response to this fee.</i>					
Long Beach (current): No specific administrative fee. Municode allows incidental enforcement costs & applicable processing fees. Low-income owners exempt. Charges can be appealed to Board of Examiners, Appeals and Condemnation.					
<i>Note: Code enforcement fees under review as part of reengineering process</i>					
Brentwood	\$350 administration fee	Imperial Beach	\$250 administration fee		
Newport Beach	\$150 administration fee	San Jose	50% of contract cost		
Riverside	\$200 administration fee	Santa Rosa	60% of contract cost		

Fee/Revenue Opportunity	Dept/Bureau	New or Modified	Fee Structure	Projected Revenue Increase	
<b>Vehicle Abatement Fee</b>	<b>Code Enf.- Planning</b>	<b>New</b>	<b>Flat \$120</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>A</b>
<p>Many cities charge a fee for the abatement of vehicles for code non-compliance reasons. We recommend the City institute a vehicle abatement fee of \$120. We estimate about 250 vehicles a year would be charged generating approximately \$30,000 per year. In addition, the City may also explore State funding opportunities for vehicle abatement with Los Angeles County.</p> <p>Long Beach (current): - No specific administrative fee.. Municode. allows incidental enforcement costs &amp; applicable processing fees. Low-income owners exempt. Charges can be appealed to Board of Examiners, Appeals and Condemnation. Note: Code enforcement fees under review as part of reengineering process</p>					
Corona	\$150	Concorde			
Pasadena	\$115	Sacramento County			
		Ventura		\$135	
<b>Re-Engineering Fee Process</b>	<b>Code Enf: Planning</b>	<b>Modified</b>	<b>Varies</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>	<b>C</b>
<p>The new Code Enforcement division is re-engineering its fee schedule, particularly the notice of violation fees and citations. Models under consideration are those employed by Oakland, Sacramento and San Diego. These models accelerate compliance and fee payment via significant penalties and fines for continued non-compliance. Staff also anticipate broadening the scope of what they inspect/abate. We estimate this effort will generate an additional \$50,000 revenue.</p>					
<b>Housing Inspection Fee</b>	<b>Code Enf.- Environ</b>	<b>Modified</b>	<b>based on size</b>	<b>\$29,000</b>	<b>A</b>
<p>We recommend the City increase these fees to eliminate the general fund subsidy of the program. it was initially suggested to increase these fees by approximately 12% to generate an additional \$139,000. Since then, the City has adopted a 10% increase to its fees, estimated to generated an additional \$110,000 in revenues. The difference of \$29,000 remains an opportunity for fee recovery as this program is currently structured.</p>					
<b>CUPA - Hazardous Waste Generator Permit Fees</b>	<b>Code Enf.- Environ</b>	<b>Modified</b>	<b>By Volume</b>	<b>\$59,000</b>	<b>A</b>
<p>These fees should be increased by approx. 15% to eliminate a \$59,000 subsidy. Long Beach inspects more frequently than Los Angeles (every year vs every third year), but charges lower permit fees.</p>					
	Long Beach (current):	Minimum fee \$131; Maximum fee \$1,685			
	City of Los Angeles:	Minimum fee \$205; Maximum fee \$1,993			
	Santa Monica	Minimum fee \$189; Maximum fee \$1,938 plus \$230 Admin. Fee			
<b>Fire Code Permits</b>	<b>Fire Prevention</b>	<b>Modified</b>	<b>Various Flat</b>	<b>\$221,145</b>	<b>A</b>
<p>PRM calculated a fully-burdened staff hourly rate of \$78 that could be used for setting Uniform Fire Code permit and State mandated fire inspection fees. This hourly rate applied to the City's nine most active fee categories yields a \$221,145 revenue opportunity. For revenue estimation purposes we project an additional \$150,000 revenue beyond what the City's fire consultant recommends.</p>					
<b>Grand Total - Revenue Recommendations</b>				<b>\$981,145</b>	

## APPENDIX C - VECTOR CONTROL DISCUSSION

---

The Health Department is responsible for Vector Control within certain areas of the city limits. While not considered a user fee, there is a General Fund subsidy that could be addressed.

A "subsidy reduction" opportunity exists within the Vector Control program: the Water Department provides \$270,174 of funding, roughly half of the full cost of the program. Environmental Health administrative staff indicates this Water Department agreement has not increased in eight years and is due for re-negotiation. The Health Department is working with the Water Department to tie costs to direct services rendered. According to the Health Department, the Water Department is interested in reducing its current funding levels.

The Health Fund subsidizes this program in the amount of \$242,195. If the Water Department reduces its funding levels or if service demand levels increase, additional funds would be required to further subsidize this activity and make up any shortfall. Health administrative staff indicates that as the West Nile Virus absorbs more local Health funds, less of these revenues would be available to fund other health service areas.

Other funding possibilities include the creation of a mosquito abatement or vector control district assessed on a per parcel basis on the portion not currently covered by such a district. One hurdle to this option is that citizens may be reluctant to vote to pay for a service that is already being provided to a degree. The Health Department could also explore opportunities to annex or to incorporate surrounding vector control districts.

An opportunity exists to take a vector control assessment to the public for consideration to ensure that other health services are not impacted. This funding tool would also allow the City to retain more direct local control and accountability in the manner in which it handles the current West Nile Virus challenge and future vector control or mosquito abatement issues.

Assessment districts are alternative financing mechanisms possibly under consideration to fund various City service areas or capital costs. Given the requirement to attain voter approval, this potential revenue is not included in Appendix B, Fee Revenue Opportunity.

A direct General Fund savings could not be identified in the Vector Control Area. The City's General Fund has subsidized the Health Department to cover citywide indirect costs. Please note that any new funding for health services, such as those generated from an assessment, may free-up other health resources and diminish the likelihood of such future subsidies.

## APPENDIX D – FIRE SUPPRESSION

---

Although PRM did not perform a gap analysis for the Fire Department's Suppression Bureau, two potential fees were brought to our attention: driving under the influence and false alarm response. The important issues regarding these fees are discussed below. Both of these fees will be further analyzed in Phase Two of our study.

### DUI Emergency Response Cost Recovery

State Government Code (GC) 53150 thru 53158 state that "any person who is under the influence of an alcoholic beverage or any drug . . . whose negligent operation of a motor vehicle caused by that influence proximately causes any incident resulting in an appropriate emergency response. . . is liable for the expense of an emergency response by a public agency to the incident." This fee is limited to \$12,000 per incident in regards to a person's liability per section 53155 (Amount updated on August 1, 2005 based on changes to legislation).

The City may opt to request a legal interpretation on State Government Code 53158 in relation to section 53155 to ensure full cost recovery opportunities are explored. Section 53158 states that it is not the intent of the Legislature to: 1) occupy the field of cost recovery for emergency response expenses by a public agency; 2) preempt local regulations; nor, 3) limit remedies available to any public agency to recover the expenses of emergency response to such an incident.

In a recent California State Municipal Finance Officers survey, 24 of 29 responding cities had a DUI emergency response cost recovery program. Some survey respondents did cite that the collection efforts may outweigh revenues generated.

Current fees collected on DUI incidents are handled by the Police Department. Fire staff presently does not recoup their response costs from DUI offenders. Fire staff stated they would first need access to Police reports to determine when services rendered are related to a DUI incident. We will facilitate this discussion and investigate the feasibility of a DUI fee for the Fire Department in Phase Two of our study.

## **APPENDIX E – SACRAMENTO FEE SCHEDULE**

---





# COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

## NOTICE OF CODE ENFORCEMENT FEE SCHEDULE\*

### To All Concerned Parties:

The purpose of this letter is to advise you of the various fees that you can be charged for code enforcement actions. The violation(s) identified by this office must be corrected by the specified date. You will be charged for all costs incurred by the County to abate any noticed violations. In addition, citations and criminal charges may be filed against you that could result in additional fines and penalties as well as time in jail.

Initial Inspection fee	\$240.00 each
Re-inspection fees	\$335.00 each
Special Cases hourly rate	Billed at the current billable rate
Initial Inspection, discretionary permit fee	\$310.00 each
Administrative Hearings – Nuisance Abatement, Vehicle Abatement, Housing Demolition, Dangerous Buildings, Lien Confirmation	Billed at actual cost of Hearing Officer or Hearing Body and staff at current billable rate
Abatement of violations	Actual cost of contract
Plus:	20% of abatement contract charge
• Abatement Administration Fee	
• Weed/Vehicle Abatement Administration Fee	\$120.00
• Attorney charges	Billed at the current billable rate for Deputy County Counsel
Infraction Citation	\$270 - \$2700 per citation
Inspection Warrant	\$123 each

It is very important for you to understand that once violations have been identified at your property, the longer you take to abate such violations, the more code enforcement fees that can be charged against your property. Such charges can continue to follow you even if you give up ownership of the property.

\* Note that the above listed fees are subject to change without further notice.

Sacramento County Code Enforcement  
(916) 874-6444

## **PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY DRAFT REPORT – NOT RECOMMENDATION OVERVIEW**

The first group of departments in the attached report, Fire, Health and Human Services, Public Works, Police, Community Development (Code Enforcement), and the Planning Bureau of the Planning and Building Department, followed the methodology described below to determine the actual cost to provide each of the services listed. The Parks, Recreation and Marine Department followed the same methodology, but rather than listing the individual services, the services are grouped by program. The Building Bureau of the Planning and Building Department is evolving a proposal for a new basis for fee setting, and therefore, had no results available for this interim report.

### Fee Setting Methodology

The methodology, which has been broadly accepted in the public sector, includes the following components:

1. Direct Cost - This includes the cost for staff time, direct supervision, equipment, supplies, vehicles, computers, and departmental overhead associated with the service provided.
2. Facility Costs - The facility operating and maintenance costs, where appropriate.
3. Indirect Cost - Each department's share of indirect cost is calculated annually through the City Indirect Cost Allocation Plan. Examples of indirect costs include the Mayor and City Council, City Attorney, City Auditor, Financial Management, and City Manager.

Once the methodology was established, each department applied the methodology in conducting their detailed analyses of the amount of time and resources involved in providing fee-related services. A sample of the underlying detail in the Phase II Fee Study is attached to this overview. The sample shows the application of the costs described above to individual fees within the Public Works fee schedule.

The current fees identified in this model incorporate the changes approved by the City Council on August 2, 2005, as well as the Recreation Commission action of July 21, 2005.

The final report is targeted for the fall of 2005, and will include more detailed information.

Agency: City of Long Beach  
Department: Public Works  
Fiscal Year: 2004/05

# SAMPLE WORKSHEET FROM PHASE II FEE STUDY

Category	Percentage
Materials & Supplies	100%

<i>Excluded</i>	General	1 Tentative Subdivision: 4 Lots	2 Tentative Subdivision: 5- 10 Lots	3 Tentative Subdivision: 11-25 Lots	4 Tentative Subdivision: 26-50 Lots	5 Tentative Subdivision: 50+ Lots	6 Final Subdivision: <25 Lots	7 Final Subdivision: >25 Lots	8 Resubmittal Check	9 Field Boundary Check
Labor Costs:										
Salary Cost \$ 272,217 100.00%	\$ 224,777 82.57%	\$ 15,082 5.54%	\$ 13,084 4.81%	\$ 1,104 0.41%	\$ 1,403 0.52%	\$ 1,752 0.64%	\$ 13,516 4.97%	\$ 917 0.34%	\$ 581 0.21%	\$ -
<i>Redistribution of General Admin Salary:</i>	\$ (224,777)	\$ 71,463	\$ 61,993	\$ 5,232	\$ 6,647	\$ 8,301	\$ 64,042	\$ 4,347	\$ 2,752	\$ -
Total Salary: \$ 272,217 100.00%	\$	\$ 86,545 31.79%	\$ 75,077 27.59%	\$ 6,336 2.33%	\$ 8,050 2.96%	\$ 10,053 3.69%	\$ 77,558 28.49%	\$ 5,264 1.93%	\$ 3,333 1.22%	\$ -
Benefits: \$ 3,344,895		\$ 1,063,430	\$ 922,521	\$ 77,857	\$ 98,915	\$ 123,531	\$ 953,002	\$ 64,684	\$ 40,955	\$ -
[Subtotal: \$ 3,617,112]	\$ -	\$ 1,149,975	\$ 997,598	\$ 84,193	\$ 106,965	\$ 133,585	\$ 1,030,560	\$ 69,948	\$ 44,288	\$ -
<b>Materials &amp; Supplies:</b>										
Materials and Supplies \$ 1,960,676		\$ 623,351	\$ 540,754	\$ 45,637	\$ 57,981	\$ 72,410	\$ 558,621	\$ 37,916	\$ 24,006	\$ -
Internal Support \$ 2,820,006		\$ 896,554	\$ 777,757	\$ 65,639	\$ 83,393	\$ 104,146	\$ 803,455	\$ 54,534	\$ 34,528	\$ -
Storm Water Contracts \$ 2,606,974		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CIP Charges \$ (3,567,946) \$ (3,567,946)		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Capital Outlay \$		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
All Other \$		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[Subtotal: \$ 3,819,710]	\$ -	\$ 1,519,905	\$ 1,318,510	\$ 111,277	\$ 141,374	\$ 176,557	\$ 1,362,076	\$ 92,450	\$ 58,535	\$ -
<b>Indirect Allocations:</b>										
<i>Citywide Overhead:</i>										
PBEN \$ 2,449,507		\$ 778,763	\$ 675,573	\$ 57,015	\$ 72,436	\$ 90,463	\$ 697,895	\$ 47,369	\$ 29,992	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<i>Departmental Overhead:</i>										
PWENAD \$ 1,213,252		\$ 385,725	\$ 334,614	\$ 28,240	\$ 35,878	\$ 44,807	\$ 345,671	\$ 23,462	\$ 14,855	\$ -
PWENAD - Utilities \$ 6,173,976 \$6,173,976		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
[Subtotal: \$ 9,836,735]	\$ -	\$ 1,164,488	\$ 1,010,188	\$ 85,256	\$ 108,315	\$ 135,270	\$ 1,043,565	\$ 70,831	\$ 44,847	\$ -
Full Cost: \$17,273,557	\$ -	\$ 3,834,367	\$ 3,326,296	\$ 280,725	\$ 356,653	\$ 445,412	\$ 3,436,201	\$ 233,229	\$ 147,669	\$ -

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### FIRE DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
1 PC-01, New Construction	68	varies	\$4,990.85	\$66,303
2 PC-02, Tenant Development	494	varies	\$719.99	\$72,884
3 PC-03, Special equipment	3	\$410.00	\$410.00	\$1,230
4 PC-04, Special Systems	7	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$2,240
5 PC-05, Fire Alarm Systems - 5 detectors	99	\$185.00	\$319.68	\$31,648
6 PC-05, Fire Alarm Systems - 20 detectors	99	\$410.00	\$426.33	\$42,206
7 PC-06, Spcl Fire Ext. Syst - 5 nozzles	35	\$185.00	\$390.76	\$13,677
8 PC-06, Spcl Fire Ext. Syst - 20 nozzles	35	\$410.00	\$461.84	\$16,164
9 PC-07, UST - Install or Removal - 1 tank	25	\$480.00	\$480.00	\$12,000
10 PC-07, UST - Install or Remvl - addl tank	24	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$6,000
11 PC-07, UST - Piping	11	\$420.00	\$420.00	\$4,620
12 PC-07, UST - Monitor wells - 1st	2	\$490.00	\$490.00	\$980
13 PC-07, UST - Monitor wells - addl well	1	\$210.00	\$210.00	\$210
14 PC-07, AST - Install or Removal - 1 tank	3	\$360.00	\$360.00	\$1,080
15 PC-07, AST - Install or Remvl - addl tank	3	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$600
16 PC-07, AST - Piping	4	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$1,280
17 PC-07, AST - Piping, addl 100 lf	4	\$160.00	\$160.00	\$640
18 PC-07, Processing Refining Tower	1	\$670.00	\$670.00	\$670
19 PC-08, Gas & liq Gas- 120-6,000 cu ft	20	\$410.00	\$410.00	\$8,200
20 PC-08, Gas & liq Gas- 6,001 - 12,000 cu ft	30	\$440.00	\$440.00	\$13,200
21 PC-08, Gas & liq Gas- 12,001+ cu ft	10	\$520.00	\$520.00	\$5,200
22 PC-09, Fire Sprinklers, >50 heads	47	\$300+ \$4/1,000 sq ft	\$586.32	\$27,557
23 PC-09, Fire Sprinkler, Tenant <50 heads	274	\$410.00	\$410.00	\$81,801

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### FIRE DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
24 PC-10, Junior Sprinkler Syst <20 heads	275	\$410.00	\$410.00	\$82,100
25 PC-11, Standpipe Systems, 5 outlets	6	\$375.00	\$426.33	\$2,558
26 PC-11, Standpipe Systems, 15 outlets	5	\$375+ \$10/ outlet	\$532.97	\$2,665
27 FP-01, General use Permits	1,033	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$60,901
28 FP-02, Tire Recapping or Rebuilding	1	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280
29 FP-03, Auto wrecking, junk yards	2	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$640
30 FP-04, Cellulose Nitrate	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
31 FP-05, Combustible Fibers	12	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$3,000
32 FP-06, Compr Gas NonFlam- 6-12k cu ft	30	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$4,500
33 FP-06, Compr Gas NonFlam- 12k+ cu ft	20	\$180.00	\$180.00	\$3,600
34 FP-06, Compr Gas Flam- 2-6k cu ft	40	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$6,000
35 FP-06, Compr Gas Flam- 6-12k cu ft	30	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$4,500
36 FP-06, Compr Gas Flam- 12k+ cu ft	20	\$180.00	\$180.00	\$3,600
37 FP-07A, Cryogenic Fluids- <500 gallons	3	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$750
38 FP-07B, Cryogenic Fluids- 500-1k gallons	1	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$320
39 FP-07C, Cryogenic Fluids- 1k+ gallons	4	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$1,560
40 FP-08, Dust Producing equip.	8	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$2,560
41 FP-09, Explosives & Blasting agents	6	\$430.00	\$430.00	\$2,580
42 FP-10, Flammable finishes	125	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$40,000
43 FP-11A, Flam Liq-storage: UST	225	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$63,000
44 FP-11B, Flam Liq-storage: Inside <60 gal	115	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$28,750
45 FP-11C, Flam Liq-storage: Inside 61+ gal	100	\$160.00	\$160.00	\$16,000
46 FP-11D, Flam Liq-storage: Outside 61+ gal	50	\$220.00	\$220.00	\$11,000

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### FIRE DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
47 FP-11E, Flam Liq-storage: AST 250k BBL	22	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$5,500
48 FP-11F, Flam Liq-storage: processing/refining cracker to	1	\$460.00	\$460.00	\$460
49 FP-12, Fumigation & Thermal insecticidal	2	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$780
50 FP-13, Garage Motor Vehicle Repair	423	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$105,750
51 FP-14A, Haz Chemicals- Corrosive	40	\$160.00	\$160.00	\$6,400
52 FP-14B, Haz Chemicals- Oxidizing	25	\$160.00	\$160.00	\$4,000
53 FP-14C, Haz Chemicals- Peroxides	2	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$640
54 FP-14D, Haz Chemicals- Nitromethane	10	\$160.00	\$160.00	\$1,600
55 FP-14E, Haz Chemicals- Ammonia Nitrate	3	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$750
56 FP-14F, Haz Chemicals- Toxic Pesticides	10	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$3,200
57 FP-15, Liquid gases	110	\$270.00	\$270.00	\$29,700
58 FP-16, Dust producing Operations	25	\$270.00	\$270.00	\$6,750
59 FP-17, Combustible Metals	8	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$2,000
60 FP-18, Matches-mfg,handling	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
61 FP-19, Oil Burning equip.	2	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$500
62 FP-20, Ovens-Baking & Drying operations	15	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$3,750
63 FP-21A, POA- A-1, 2000+	8	\$780.00	\$780.00	\$6,240
64 FP-21B, POA- A-1, 1000 to 1999+	2	\$710.00	\$710.00	\$1,420
65 FP-21C, POA- A-2	3	\$460.00	\$460.00	\$1,380
66 FP-21D, POA- A-2.1, 2000+	5	\$460.00	\$460.00	\$2,300
67 FP-21E, POA- A-2.1, 300 to 1999+	120	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$10,946
68 FP-21F, POA- A-3	606	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$35,727
69 FP-22, Mechanical Refrigeration	9	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$2,250

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### FIRE DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
70 FP-23, Airports, Heliports	3	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$1,170
71 FP-24, Rifle ranges	1	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280
72 FP-25, High pile combustible storage	46	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$11,500
73 FP-26, Aircraft hangers-serv. & repair	12	\$460.00	\$460.00	\$5,520
74 FP-27, High Rise Bldg. Over 75 ft.	67	\$1,170.00	\$1,170.00	\$78,390
75 FP-27F, Each floor level ground or below	70	\$0.00		\$0
76 FP-28A, Fire Clearance Occupancy	791	\$210.00	\$248.96	\$30,814
77 FP-28J, Fire Clearance Occ - Hospital	7	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$2,730
78 FP-29, Dry Cleaning Plant w/hazardous	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
79 FP-30, Lumber yards	7	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$2,730
80 FP-31, Malls, covered	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
81 FP-32, Oil & Natural gas wells, each	1	\$270.00	\$270.00	\$270
82 FP-33, Aircraft fueling station	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
83 FP-34, Aircraft Refueler (truck)	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
84 FP-35, Airport fueling system	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
85 FP-36, Asbestos Removal	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
86 FP-37, Auto fueling Station	4	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$1,000
87 FP-38, Candles & open Flames	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
88 FP-39, Carnival & Fairs	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
89 FP-40, Commercial Rubbish-handling OP	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
90 FP-41, Compressed Gasses	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
91 FP-42, Dip Tanks	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
92 FP-43, Marine Service Station	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### FIRE DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
93 FP-44, Natural Gasoline Plant	1	\$1,530.00	\$1,530.00	\$1,530
94 FP-45, Oil/Gas wells, initial insp.	1	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$200
95 FP-45, Oil/Gas wells, re-insp.	1	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110
96 FP-45, Oil/Gas wells, vent insp.	1	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$390
97 FP-45, Oil/Gas wells, abandon review	1	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$390
98 FP-45, Oil/Gas wells, abandon insp	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
99 FP-45, Oil/Gas wells, drill or re-drill	1	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$390
100 FP-46, Organic Coating	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
101 FP-47, Paint, Coating, other finish	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
102 FP-48, Pyrotechnical Spec. Effects	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
103 FP-49, Roofing Kettle	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
104 FP-50, Welding & Cutting Operations	74	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$18,500
105 FP-51, Non-payment of fire permit fee	1	\$260.00	\$260.00	\$260
106 RE-N, Reinspection fee	8	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$2,560
107 FNCI, Non-compliance fee for USTS	1	\$290.00	\$290.00	\$290
108 FREI, HazMat & UST non-compliance	25	\$290.00	\$290.00	\$7,250
109 SA-01, Fireworks-outside display	1	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$390
110 SA-02, Blasting Operations	1	\$460.00	\$460.00	\$460
111 SA-03A, Spec.Events <30ksq ft	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
112 SA-03B, Spec.Events 30-60k sq ft	1	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280
113 SA-03C, Spec.Events 60-90k sq ft	1	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$320
114 SA-03D, Spec.Events 90-120k sq ft	1	\$390.00	\$390.00	\$390
115 SA-03E, Spec.Events 120-150k sq ft	1	\$460.00	\$460.00	\$460

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.



# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### FIRE DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
116 SA-03F, Spec.Events 150k+ sq ft	1	\$570.00	\$570.00	\$570
117 SA-04, Tents & Air Support Structures	1	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250
118 SA-05, Bowling Alley	1	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280
119 SA-06, Fumigation or Thermal	1	\$280.00	\$280.00	\$280
120 SA-07, Hot Air Balloon	1	\$320.00	\$320.00	\$320
122 SA-08, Helistop,temporary landing	1	\$360.00	\$360.00	\$360
123 MS-02, Standby Fire Prevention	1	\$70/hr	\$70/hr	\$70
124 MS-02, Marine Safety- land watch	250	\$60/hr	\$60/hr	\$15,000
125 MS-02, Marine Safety-Water Enf	505	\$210/hr	\$210/hr	\$35,247
126 MS-03, Fire Dept. w/crew	1	\$370.00	\$370.00	\$370
127 MS-04, Fire Dept, Ambulance	1	\$650.00	\$650.00	\$650
128 MS-04, Fire Dept, Fire Engine	1	\$1,300.00	\$1,300.00	\$1,300
129 MS-04, Fire Dept, Ladder Truck	1	\$1,340.00	\$1,340.00	\$1,340
130 MS-05, Copies of Documents	1	\$0.10	\$0.10	\$0
131 MS-06, Overnight stay without fire watch	1	\$180.00	\$180.00	\$180
132 FRG1, Range 1, Minor	240	\$130.00	\$130.00	\$31,200
133 FRG2, Range 2, Moderate	58	\$160.00	\$160.00	\$9,280
134 FRG3, Range 3, Major	54	\$220.00	\$220.00	\$11,880
135 FRG4, Extraordinary sites	51	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$20,400
136 Junior Lifeguard	452	\$260.00	\$326.22	\$29,930
137 Failed Routine Reinspection	tbd	\$0.00	n/a	n/a
138 Fire False Alarm	tbd	\$0.00	n/a	n/a

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
1 Mult Dwelling Units: 4-10 units	3142	\$150	\$292	\$917,589
2 Mult Dwelling Units: 11-20 units	605	\$159	\$340	\$205,480
3 Mult Dwelling Units: 21+ units	269	\$167	\$390	\$104,895
4 Mult Dwelling Units: Rooming House	29	\$99	\$251	\$7,285
5 Mult Dwelling Units: Boarding School	1	\$468	\$417	\$417
6 Bed & Breakfast: 1-5 rooms	5	\$109	\$295	\$1,474
7 Bed & Breakfast: 6-20 rooms	15	\$295	\$351	\$5,258
8 Hotels/Motels: 6-10 rooms	16	\$256	\$292	\$4,673
9 Hotels/Motels: 11-50 rooms	104	\$416	\$340	\$35,322
10 Hotels/Motels: 51+ rooms	26	\$1,123	\$390	\$10,139
11 Misc Housing Fees: reinspection	500	\$113	\$158	\$78,812
12 Misc Housing Fees: late payment penalty	800	\$0	\$16	\$12,751
13 Misc Housing Fees: Copy of Record	200	\$0.10	\$13	\$2,649
14 Restaurant: 0-10 seats	239	\$466	\$846	\$202,114
15 Restaurant: 11-30 seats	314	\$596	\$878	\$275,622
16 Restaurant: 31-60 seats	295	\$688	\$910	\$268,417
17 Restaurant: 61-100 seats	143	\$769	\$942	\$134,706
18 Restaurant: 101-150 seats	72	\$977	\$974	\$70,136
19 Restaurant: 151-200 seats	38	\$993	\$1,006	\$38,236
20 Restaurant: 201-400 seats	43	\$1,089	\$1,038	\$44,648
21 Restaurant: 401+ seats	15	\$1,239	\$1,103	\$16,538
22 Food Mkt Retail: 10-50 sq ft	52	\$179	\$550	\$28,584

a)

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
23 Food Mkt Retail: 51-1999 sq ft	429	\$424	\$599	\$256,780
24 Food Mkt Retail: 2000-5999 sq ft	158	\$543	\$748	\$118,248
25 Food Mkt Retail: 6000 + sq ft	62	\$798	\$577	\$35,783
26 Food Mkt Wholesale	7	\$424	\$846	\$5,920
27 Fruit-Veg. Market Wholesale	1	\$424	\$846	\$846
28 Food Service Cart: w/o Plumbing	24	\$256	\$449	\$10,776
29 Food Service Cart: w/ Plumbing	33	\$451	\$757	\$24,974
30 Vehicles: Food Retail / No preparation	128	\$252	\$462	\$59,118
31 Vehicles: Mobile Food Preparation	90	\$585	\$999	\$89,943
36 Vehicles: Offal Collection Co.	1	\$80	\$154	\$154
38 Vehicles: Food Vehicle Permit Transfer	10	\$45	\$92	\$924
39 Retail Food Proc: 1-1999 sq ft	13	\$799	\$1,244	\$16,174
40 Retail Food Proc: 2000-5999 sq ft	8	\$1,376	\$2,033	\$16,267
41 Retail Food Proc: 6000+ sq ft	1	\$2,070	\$2,926	\$2,926
42 Wholesale Food Proc: 1-1999 sq ft	5	\$799	\$1,244	\$6,221
43 Wholesale Food Proc: 2000-5999 sq ft	4	\$1,376	\$2,033	\$8,134
44 Wholesale Food Proc: 6000+ sq ft	1	\$2,070	\$2,997	\$2,997
45 Food Salvager	1	\$1,463	\$2,033	\$2,033
46 Temp Food Stand	600	\$61	\$145	\$87,023
47 Community Event Organizer	121	\$90	\$165	\$19,908
48 Vending Machines	17	\$50	\$151	\$2,559
49 Seasonal	20	\$0	\$0	\$0

b)

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

## ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
b) 50 Personal Hawker/Peddler	1	\$0	\$0	\$0
51 Food Demonstrator	1	\$136	\$213	\$213
52 Reinspection Fee	150	\$110	\$179	\$26,811
a) 53 Late Payment Penalty	200	\$0	\$17	\$3,494
54 Add a Partner	10	\$30	\$46	\$461
56 Pigeon Keeper	13	\$36	\$159	\$2,062
57 Massage Parlor	105	\$63	\$172	\$18,043
58 Health Parlor	27	\$63	\$172	\$4,640
h) 59 Blood Pressure Machine	1	\$0	\$0	\$0
60 Childrens Camp	1	\$326	\$517	\$517
61 Private Stable	12	\$73	\$205	\$2,457
62 Animal Keeper	1	\$172	\$205	\$205
h) 63 Wiping Rag Business	1	\$0	\$0	\$0
64 Laundry: 1-4000 sq ft	111	\$114	\$172	\$19,074
65 Laundry: 4001+ sq ft	4	\$246	\$192	\$766
66 Water Fees: Swim Pool/Spa (public)	561	\$177	\$293	\$164,502
g) 67 Water Fees: Backflow Prevention Device	1	\$0	\$151	\$151
68 Water Fees: Water Dist Line Clearance	2	\$189	n/a	\$378
i) 69 Water Fees: Sewage Cleaning Vehicles	1	\$153	n/a	\$153
i) 70 Water Fees: Toilet Rental Agency	1	\$309	n/a	\$309
i) 71 Water Fees: Private Waste Collector	1	\$255	n/a	\$255
72 Water Fees: Reinspection Fee	10	\$110	\$147	\$1,466

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

## ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
73 Med Waste: Sm Quantity w/ onsite treatment	1	\$111	\$340	\$340
74 Med Waste: Sm Quantity (<200 lbs/month)	2	\$28	\$239	\$478
75 Med Waste: Lmted Quant Hauling Exmpt 1-4 names	46	\$28	\$340	\$15,625
76 Med Waste: Lmted Quant Hauling Exmpt, addtl name	1	\$5	\$340	\$340
77 Med Waste: Common Stor Facil, 2-10 Gen.	2	\$117	\$259	\$518
78 Med Waste: Common Stor Facil, 11-49 Gen.	5	\$307	\$299	\$1,497
79 Med Waste: Common Stor Facil, 50+ Gen.	4	\$613	\$400	\$1,601
80 Med Waste: Transfer Station - Large Quant.	1	\$613	\$521	\$521
81 Med Waste: Acute Care Hosp., 1-99 beds	1	\$735	\$1,187	\$1,187
82 Med Waste: Acute Care Hosp., 100-199 beds	1	\$1,053	\$1,717	\$1,717
83 Med Waste: Acute Care Hosp., 200-250 beds	1	\$1,348	\$3,261	\$3,261
84 Med Waste: Acute Care Hosp., 251+ beds	1	\$1,714	\$3,775	\$3,775
85 Med Waste: Specialty Clinic (surgical, etc.)	14	\$429	\$642	\$8,993
86 Med Waste: Skill Nursing Facil, 1-99 beds	1	\$337	\$400	\$400
87 Med Waste: Skill Nursing Facil, 100-199 beds	1	\$429	\$461	\$461
88 Med Waste: Skill Nursing Facil, 200+ beds	1	\$490	\$642	\$642
89 Med Waste: Acute Psychiatric Hospital	1	\$244	\$521	\$521
90 Med Waste: Intermediate Care	1	\$367	\$521	\$521
91 Med Waste: Primary Care	1	\$429	\$763	\$763
92 Med Waste: Clinical Laboratory	1	\$244	\$340	\$340
93 Med Waste: Health Care Service Plan Facil.	1	\$429	\$763	\$763
94 Med Waste: Veterinary Clinic or Hosp.	1	\$244	\$400	\$400

c)

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
95 Med Waste: Med/Dental/Vet Offices (200lb/mo)	3	\$244	\$249	\$747
96 Med Waste: Nurse-Occup Care (<200lbs/mo)	1	\$122	\$340	\$340
97 Med Waste: Nurse-Occup Care (>200lbs/mo)	1	\$367	\$521	\$521
98 Med Waste: Each Autoclave	1	\$2,449	\$400	\$400
101 Med Waste: Tattoo Parlor	3	\$59	\$249	\$747
102 Garment Manufacturing	36	\$213	\$269	\$9,672
103 Noise Variance	1	\$150	\$175	\$175
104 Noise Control Business Lic. Insp.	1	\$103	\$175	\$175
106 CUPA: Small Quantity Specified Waste	105	\$166	\$308	\$32,295
107 CUPA: Haz Waste Producer 0-4 employees	558	\$346	\$374	\$208,472
108 CUPA: Haz Waste Producer 5-19 employees	236	\$582	\$440	\$103,754
109 CUPA: Haz Waste Producer 20-100 employees	58	\$963	\$572	\$33,159
110 CUPA: Haz Waste Producer 101-500 employees	11	\$1,603	\$704	\$7,741
111 CUPA: Haz Waste Producer 501+ employees	7	\$2,132	\$836	\$5,851
112 CUPA: X-ray Machine Silver Halide Generator	1	\$63	\$242	\$242
113 CUPA: Reinspection Fee	100	\$126	\$291	\$29,107
114 CUPA: Late Payment Penalty	1	\$0	\$0	\$0
115 CUPA: Permit by Rule	1	\$1,932	\$1,427	\$1,427
116 CUPA: Conditional Authorization	1	\$1,932	\$1,366	\$1,366
117 CUPA: Conditional Exemption, 1st year	1	\$156	\$425	\$425
118 CUPA: Conditional Exemption, renewal	1	\$78	\$425	\$425
119 CUPA: UST Site Characterization, 1st year	20	\$298	\$514	\$10,271

a)

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
120 CUPA: UST Remedial Oversight, annually	20	\$150	\$374	\$7,472
121 CUPA: RMP Review, Pgm 1	1	\$1,710	\$7,590	\$7,590
122 CUPA: RMP Review, Pgm 2/3	1	\$2,083	\$22,283	\$22,283
123 CUPA: Each Addl Regulated Matl	1	\$1,093	\$4,918	\$4,918
124 PC: Restaurant, 0-60 seats	40	\$498	\$1,028	\$41,113
125 PC: Restaurant, 61-200 seats	30	\$746	\$1,418	\$42,540
126 PC: Restaurant, 201+ seats	20	\$796	\$1,489	\$29,779
127 PC: Restaurant, Minor Remodel	25	\$0	\$24	\$591
128 PC: Food Mkt Retail, 10-50 sq ft	5	\$217	\$655	\$3,277
129 PC: Food Mkt Retail, 51-1999 sq ft	15	\$300	\$691	\$10,363
130 PC: Food Mkt Retail, 2000-5999 sq ft	10	\$416	\$975	\$9,746
131 PC: Food Mkt Retail, 6000+ sq ft	5	\$526	\$1,081	\$5,405
132 PC: Food Mkt Retail, Minor Remodel	1	\$0	\$24	\$24
133 PC: Food Processor, 1-1999 sq ft	1	\$328	\$691	\$691
134 PC: Food Processor, 2000-5999 sq ft	1	\$526	\$1,134	\$1,134
135 PC: Food Processor, 6000+ sq ft	1	\$767	\$1,418	\$1,418
136 PC: Food Processor, Minor Remodel	1	\$0	\$24	\$24
137 PC: Misc Food, Food Warehouse	1	\$239	\$584	\$584
138 PC: Misc Food, Food Salvager	1	\$305	\$584	\$584
139 PC: Misc Food, Food Vehicle	1	\$227	\$443	\$443
140 PC: Bed & Breakfast, 1-20 rooms	1	\$372	\$691	\$691
141 PC: Water System, Swim Pool/Spa	1	\$126	\$698	\$698

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
142 PC: Water System, Remodel of Pool	1	\$106	\$698	\$698
143 PC: Water System, Sewage Disposal Syst	1	\$376	\$570	\$570
144 PC: Water System, Water Well Const.	1	\$192	\$331	\$331
145 PC: Water System, Monitoring Well	1	\$119	\$331	\$331
146 PC: Water System, Water Well Abandonment	1	\$200	\$331	\$331
147 PC: Water System, Soil Borings/Probes	1	\$159	\$331	\$331
148 PC: Water System, Cathodic Wells	1	\$212	\$331	\$331
149 PC: Water System, Backflow Device	1	\$66	\$618	\$618

- a) *This is a punitive fee, a 25% late charge is assessed. The calculated costs shown, reflect the staff processing time involved.*
- b) *These fees vary and are charge based off hourly rates.*
- c) *There is a \$50 maximum for additional names*
- d) *The revenue shown is an average of 5 years.*
- e) *All Haz Mat emergency responses are charged at fully burdened costs.*
- f) *Fee charged is 50% of original permit costs. The costs shown only display clerical processing*
- g) *Currently, there is a \$9 fee listed on the fee schedule, but it is not being collected.*
- h) *Hardly ever used, considering eliminating*
- i) *Considering changing to an hourly charge.*

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.



# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
1 Tentative Subdivision: 4 Lots	20	\$400+\$5/lot	2,292.13	\$45,843
2 Tentative Subdivision: 5-10 Lots	15	\$400+\$5/lot	2,651.21	\$39,768
3 Tentative Subdivision: 11-25 Lots	1	\$400+\$5/lot	3,356.26	\$3,356
4 Tentative Subdivision: 26-50 Lots	1	\$400+\$5/lot	4,264.03	\$4,264
5 Tentative Subdivision: 50+ Lots	1	\$400+\$5/lot	5,325.21	\$5,325
6 Final Subdivision: <25 Lots	25	\$2,200+ \$200/acre	1,643.29	\$41,082
7 Final Subdivision: >25 Lots	1	\$2,200+ \$200/acre	2,788.42	\$2,788
8 Resubmittal Check	10	\$250.00	176.55	\$1,765
9 Field Boundary Check	1	\$150 + \$10/point	no data	no data
10 Financial Guarantee Extension	1	\$150.00	no data	no data
11 Certificate of Compliance	15	\$150.00	955.97	\$14,339
12 Field Site Review and/or Impr Cert	400	\$125.00	176.55	\$70,619
13 Tree Planting*	4	\$275.00	no data	no data
14 Minor Lot Adjustment	15	\$250.00	955.97	\$14,339
15 Improv. Plan Review - 1 sheet	70	\$375/sheet	792.80	\$55,496
16 Resubmittal for 4th check: 1 sheet	15	\$150/sheet	792.80	\$11,892
17 Tent & final St Vacation: 1000 sq ft	2	\$1,350.00	4,851.66	\$9,703
18 Tent & Final St Vacation: 5000 sq ft	2	\$2,000.00	6,363.81	\$12,728
19 Tent & Final St Vacation: 25000 sq ft	2	\$3,000.00	7,641.68	\$15,283
20 Tent & Final St Vacation: 40000 sq ft	2	\$4,000.00	8,919.56	\$17,839
21 Quitclaim: 1,000 sq ft	2	\$325.00	2,087.00	\$4,174
22 Quitclaim: 10,000 sq ft	2	\$500.00	2,192.23	\$4,384
23 Quitclaim: 20,000 sq ft	2	\$650.00	2,297.47	\$4,595

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
24 Deed Processing: Dedications	20	\$250.00	978.98	\$19,580
25 Deed Processing: Easements	6	\$400.00	1,644.88	\$9,869
26 Encroachment Basic - 50 sq ft	1	\$500 + \$2/sq ft	no data	no data
27 Encroachment Annual Renewal	1	\$50 + penalty	no data	no data
28 Sidewalk Dining Pmt: 50 sq ft	35	\$250.00	1,820.00	\$63,700
29 Sidewalk Dining Pmt: 200 sq ft	13	\$500.00	1,908.28	\$24,808
30 Sidewalk Dining Pmt: 400 sq ft	4	\$750.00	1,996.55	\$7,986
31 Sidewalk Dining Pmt: 600 sq ft	2	\$2/sq ft	1,980.47	\$3,961
32 Excavations: 10 sq ft	60	\$70.00	1,075.83	\$64,550
33 Excavations: 100 sq ft	20	\$250.00	1,075.83	\$21,517
34 Excavations: 1,000 sq ft	2	\$1,375.00	1,075.83	\$2,152
35 Excavations: 5,000 sq ft	1	\$4,375.00	1,075.83	\$1,076
36 Excavations: 10,000 sq ft	1	\$6,250.00	1,209.91	\$1,210
37 Excavations: 15,000 sq ft	1	\$7,500.00	1,209.91	\$1,210
38 Excavations: GroundH2O monitor well	2	\$125/ location	1,276.95	\$2,554
39 Excavations: Soil Borings	2	\$75/ location	1,075.83	\$2,152
40 Excavations: Manhole or other Adj.	2	\$50/ location	1,075.83	\$2,152
41 St Impv Pmt \$300 Value	15	\$60.00	313.78	\$4,707
42 St Impv Pmt \$750 Value	15	\$105.00	313.78	\$4,707
43 St Impv Pmt \$1,250 Value	15	\$147.00	313.78	\$4,707
44 St Impv Pmt \$2,000 Value	15	\$188.00	420.78	\$6,312
45 St Impv Pmt \$3,000 Value	15	\$232.00	527.78	\$7,917
46 St Impv Pmt \$4,000 Value	15	\$298.00	527.78	\$7,917

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
47 St Impv Pmt \$5,000 Value	15	\$368.00	678.62	\$10,179
48 St Impv Pmt: Under Sidewalk Roof Drain	15	\$78.00	420.78	\$6,312
49 St Impv Pmt: Wheel Chair Ramp Finishing	15	\$550.00	420.78	\$6,312
50 Temp St Parking - const. vehicles	150	\$24.00	420.78	\$63,117
51 Pmt Processing: trash bins	1	\$5.00	296.75	no data
52 Pmt Processing: others	1	\$35.00	296.75	\$297
53 Site Inspection	1	\$25.00	296.75	\$297
54 St Use Fee: Trash Bin - 1 week*	363	\$1.50	no data	no data
55 St Use Fee: 200 sq ft	60.5	\$2/week	364.88	\$22,075

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### POLICE DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
1 Alarm System annual - business	3327	\$25	\$26	\$86,502
2 Alarm System 3 yr - residential	7216	\$30	\$26	\$187,616
3 Arcade	1	\$250	\$41	\$41
4 Auto Wrecking	1	\$20	\$33	\$33
5 Boxing/Wrestling	1	\$350	\$397	\$397
6 Charitable Solicitation	45	\$10	\$417	\$18,773
7 Closeout Sale	1	\$135	\$33	\$33
8 Closeout Sale ea. Addtl day >30	1	\$20	\$33	\$33
9 Coin, Stamp Dealer - initial	1	\$20	\$85	\$85
10 Coin, Stamp Dealer - annual	1	\$100	\$460	\$460
11 Fortunetelling	1	\$20	\$240	\$240
12 Garage Sale	31	\$10	\$161	\$5,005
13 Junk Collector	1	\$20	\$115	\$115
15 Junk Dealer - annual	1	\$75	\$903	\$903
16 Exclusive Event	21	\$25	\$371	\$7,781
18 Massage Parlor - annual	1	\$100	\$420	\$420
20 Masseuse -annual	24	\$100	\$402	\$9,650
22 Pawn Broker - initial	1	\$1,070	\$622	\$622
23 Secondhand Dealer - initial	1	\$15	\$416	\$416
24 Pawn Broker/Secondhand dealer renewal	100	\$0	\$171	\$17,108
25 Display/Selling Even Promoter	6	\$20	\$516	\$3,095
26 Swap Meets	1	\$20	\$599	\$599
27 Peddler	1	\$20	\$37	\$37

NOTE: Department are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### POLICE DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
28 Publicly Accessible Exterior Pay Telephone	1	\$15	\$23	\$23
33 Pool or Billiard Hall (1 or 2 tables)	1	\$100	\$206	\$206
34 Pool or Billiard Hall (3 or more tables)	1	\$350	\$2,292	\$2,292
35 Family Billiard Hall	1	\$350	\$2,404	\$2,404
36 Card Room - initial	1	\$1,100	\$2,143	\$2,143
37 Bowling Alley	1	\$450	\$1,966	\$1,966
38 Entertainment permit - initial	21	\$750	\$2,875	\$60,382
39 Entertainment permit - temp	1	\$600	\$2,875	\$2,875
40 Entertainment permit - annual	1	\$750	\$1,686	\$1,686
45 Sidewalk Sale	1	\$20	\$20	\$20
47 Taxi Driver - annual	192	\$20	\$230	\$44,231
48 Taxi Owner	36	\$0	\$305	\$10,992
49 Taxi Owner - addtl person on app	15	\$0	\$166	\$2,487
50 Taxi Owner - addtl share purchase	6	\$0	\$128	\$769
51 Taxi Owner - corporation	10	\$0	\$170	\$1,700
52 Towing Operations - initial	1	\$409	\$802	\$802
54 Social Club - initial	1	\$350	\$2,836	\$2,836
55 Social Club - annual	1	\$250	\$1,647	\$1,647
56 Pedicab driver	1	\$0	\$399	\$399
57 Adult Entertainment Business (LBMC 21.51.020)	1	\$250	\$2,363	\$2,363
58 Escort Bureau Service	1	\$1,000	\$2,310	\$2,310
62 Firearm Dealer new/renewal	1	\$20	\$513	\$513
66 Painting House Numbers on Curbs (90-day permit)	1	\$125	\$26	\$26

NOTE: Department are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### POLICE DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
67 Duplicate License	1	\$25	\$27	\$27
68 Notification Fee (Hearing)	1	\$1	\$4	\$4
69 Duplicate Decal	1	\$10	\$12	\$12
70 Appeal Filing Fee (City Council)	1	\$1,050	\$127	\$127
71 Appeal Filing Fee (Director)	1	\$350	\$127	\$127
72 Endorsement of Change of Address	1	\$25	\$27	\$27
73 Repossession	383	\$15	\$26	\$9,958
74 Clearance Letter	450	\$10	\$26	\$11,844
75 Section 8 Background Check	828	\$15	\$26	\$21,793
76 Civil Subpoena	117	\$15	\$467	\$54,630
79 Tow Truck Driver	1	\$0	\$195	\$195
80 Masseuse - Add/change location	27	\$0	\$289	\$7,792

a) also requires live scan fee

NOTE: Department are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### CODE ENFORCEMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
<b>Standard Program</b>				
1 Demolition - Contract Preparation	4	\$150	\$251	\$1,005
2 Demolition - Performance Inspection	4	\$90	\$93	\$371
3 Demo - Performance Insp and Billing Costs	12	\$120	\$93	\$1,113
4 Notice of Lein Doc	100	\$60	\$93	\$9,275
5 Nuisance - Trans Lien to Tax Collector	13	\$90	\$79	\$1,030
6 Administrative Hearing	36	\$0	\$119	\$4,289
7 Issue Inspection Warrant	50	\$0	\$330	\$16,517
8 Code Enf Officer - Hourly Rate	100	\$84	\$79	\$7,919
<b>Weed Abatement Program</b>				
9 Weed Abatement - Contract Prep	50	\$120	\$79	\$3,960
10 Weed Abatement - Performance Insp	50	\$120	\$79	\$3,960
11 Weed Abatement - Trans Lien to Tax Collector	50	\$60	\$79	\$3,960
<b>Other Programs</b>				
12 Special Projects	1	\$0	\$490,466	\$490,466
13 Citation-Related Activity	1	\$0	\$4,106,336	\$4,106,336

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
1 Categorical Exemptions	500	\$125.00	\$152.60	\$76,302
2 Neg Dec - res 1-6 units	1	\$1,250.00	\$4,821.31	\$4,821
3 Neg Dec - res 40 units	5	\$4,650.00	\$4,944.91	\$24,725
4 Neg Dec - commercial	40	\$2,700.00	\$4,944.91	\$197,797
5 Neg Dec - indust.	2	\$2,700.00	\$4,944.91	\$9,890
6 Neg Dec - indust. w/ haz mat	1	\$5,200.00	\$4,944.91	\$4,945
7 Neg Dec - review of \$25k tech study	1	10%	\$3,842.86	\$3,843
8 Mitigation Monitoring Plan	1	\$300.00	\$1,969.47	\$1,969
9 City Prep. EIR	1	\$20,000.00	\$15,555.84	\$15,556
10 Mod of Mit Measure w/ Comm Apvl	1	\$525.00	\$1,554.88	\$1,555
11 Continued Hearing	1	\$250.00	\$625.92	\$626
12 File Search	1	\$25.00	\$97.23	\$97
13 Est. Internet Trans. Account	1	\$28.00	no data	no data
14 Zone Change	8	\$3,400.00	\$6,277.40	\$50,219
15 GPA	8	\$3,400.00	\$6,009.30	\$48,074
16 GPA in Coastal Zone	1	\$4,400.00	\$6,009.30	\$6,009
17 Private Ordinance Amend.	1	\$4,400.00	\$5,893.11	\$5,893
18 Req. by Appl for Continuance Hearing	5	\$250.00	\$483.04	\$2,415
19 Rezone for GP Conformity cert by PC	7	\$750.00	\$1,792.39	\$12,547
20 Annexation	1	\$7,000.00	\$5,860.62	\$5,861
21 CUP - Care Facil < 30 Units	1	\$1,000.00	\$4,303.75	\$4,304
22 CUP - Non Profit Shelter	1	\$0.00	\$4,303.75	\$4,304
23 Other CUP's	50	\$2,000.00	\$4,303.75	\$215,187

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and assessing policies for subsidies.



# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
24 CUP - Appeal to Council	7	\$1,200.00	\$1,796.04	\$12,572
25 CUP - Mod to Approvd pmt w/ PC hear	2	\$600.00	\$2,393.56	\$4,787
26 CUP - Continued Hearing	1	\$250.00	\$483.04	\$483
27 CUP - Mod to Appvd Permit/ Adm Hear	1	\$420.00	\$2,520.27	\$2,520
28 Time Extension	17	\$250.00	\$471.89	\$8,022
29 Appeal to PC	4	\$1,200.00	\$2,005.69	\$8,023
30 AUP - Fence Height	1	\$400.00	\$2,568.30	\$2,568
31 AUP - All Others	36	\$800.00	\$2,568.30	\$92,459
32 Minor Modification - no hearing	41	\$350.00	\$373.50	\$15,313
33 Establish Setback	1	\$3,400.00	\$6,034.23	\$6,034
34 Tent Map - Condo Conv.	21	\$2,000+ \$100/unit	\$2,922.09	\$61,364
35 Tent Map - Other	12	\$2,000+ \$100/lot	\$4,207.68	\$50,492
36 Tent Map - Vesting	12	\$200.00	\$192.14	\$2,306
37 Final Map - Condo Conv.	21	\$1,100+ \$100/unit	\$703.02	\$14,763
38 Final Map - New Const & Other Subdiv.	7	\$600+ \$100/lot	\$703.02	\$4,921
39 Vesting Final Map	12	\$200.00	\$703.02	\$8,436
40 Mod to Approved Tent or Final Map	1	\$1,100+ \$50/lot line	\$2,279.22	\$2,279
41 Time Extension for filing final map	1	\$250.00	\$318.73	\$319
42 Certificate of Compl.	9	\$200.00	\$757.79	\$6,820
43 Merger	10	\$800.00	\$751.05	\$7,511
44 Minor Lot Line Adj.	13	\$800.00	\$1,179.32	\$15,331
45 Continuance of Tent Map	1	\$200.00	\$373.50	\$373
46 Cert of Exclusion for Comm. Apartment	1	\$150.00	\$757.79	\$758

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
47 Mini Variance	20	\$400.00	\$2,441.71	\$48,834
48 Other Variances	112	\$400.00	\$2,568.30	\$287,650
49 Appeal to PC of Variance Denial or Cond of Appvl	1	\$1,200.00	\$2,033.07	\$2,033
50 Modification to Appvd Permit	10	\$420.00	\$373.50	\$3,735
51 Time Extension	1	\$250.00	\$373.50	\$373
52 Continuance	1	\$250.00	\$150.84	\$151
53 Classificatn of Use	1	\$1,200.00	\$4,111.60	\$4,112
54 Zoning Confirmation Letter	243	\$125.00	\$373.50	\$90,760
55 Business License Zoning Appvl	262	\$14.00	\$48.04	\$12,585
56 File Retrieval after Appeal Period	1	\$25.00	no data	no data
57 Pay Phone Approval - 1 phone	1	\$65.00	\$96.07	\$96
58 Pay Phone Zoning Appvl - Additional Phone	1	\$35.00	\$96.07	\$96
59 Request for Zoning Sign Pmt - 1 Sign	450	\$80.00	\$96.07	\$43,232
60 Request for Zoning Sign Pmt - Addtl Sign	20	\$35.00	\$48.04	\$961
61 Promotional Activity Sign Permit	50	\$50.00	\$48.04	\$2,402
62 Appeal of Sign Permits	1	\$600.00	\$1,738.58	\$1,739
63 Sign Program (addn to sign fees)	1	\$450.00	\$1,205.68	\$1,206
64 Site Plan Review - 3k sq ft	1	\$900+\$3/ 100 sq ft	\$1,941.03	\$1,941
65 Site Plan Review - 20k sq ft	88	\$900+\$3/ 100 sq ft	\$2,112.67	\$185,915
66 Site Plan Review - Density Bonus	1	\$2,250.00	\$2,593.03	\$2,593
67 Site Plan Review - Concept - 3k sq ft	12	\$900+\$1.50/100 sq ft	\$2,112.67	\$25,352
68 Site Plan Review - Concept - 20k sq ft	1	\$900+\$1.50/100 sq ft	\$2,160.70	\$2,161
69 Local Dev Permit - no other pmt req.	10	\$1,000.00	\$2,568.30	\$25,683

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
70 Local Dev Permit - other pmt req.	36	\$165.00	\$282.82	\$10,182
71 Categorical Excl. from Coastal Act	19	\$75.00	\$96.07	\$1,825
72 Local Coastal Dvl Pmt - sub to Coast Com	1	\$1,075.00	\$1,555.70	\$1,556
73 Local Coastal Plan Amend.	1	\$1,150.00	\$5,360.28	\$5,360
74 Appeal from prop owner for LC Pmt	1	\$400.00	\$2,033.07	\$2,033
76 W/ no other Application	1	\$2,000.00	\$4,207.68	\$4,208
77 W/ staff site plan review	1	\$500.00	\$126.59	\$127
78 W/ Commisn Site Plan, CUP, or Rezone	1	\$500.00	\$510.87	\$511
79 W/ Variance, AUP or Class of Use	1	\$1,000.00	\$510.87	\$511
80 Appeals	1	\$1,200.00	\$2,033.07	\$2,033
81 Street Name Change	1	\$0.00	\$2,732.63	\$2,733
82 Prelim Rvw of Plan -Adv Comm - 3k sq ft	1	\$900+\$1.50 sq ft	\$2,112.67	\$2,113
83 Prelim Rvw of Plan -Adv Comm - 20k sq ft	88	\$900+\$1.50 sq ft	\$2,112.67	\$185,915
84 CUP - Exemption Letter	86	\$250.00	\$538.26	\$46,290
85 Developmnt Agreement	1	\$4,400.00	\$7,177.61	\$7,178
86 Interim Park Use Permit	1	\$300.00	\$1,188.91	\$1,189
87 Fences	95	\$10.00	\$90.09	\$8,559
88 Comm. Review	70	\$0.00	\$90.09	\$6,307
89 Staff Review	40	\$200.00	\$255.61	\$10,224
90 Comm. Sign	5	\$25.00	\$391.80	\$1,959
91 Major Projects	30	\$250.00	\$391.80	\$11,754
92 Demolition, Residential	1	\$200.00	\$343.76	\$344
93 Demolition, Commercial	1	\$750.00	\$343.76	\$344

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

SERVICE NAME	ANNUAL VOLUME	CURRENT FEE	PER SERVICE FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
94 Appeal to PC of denial, C of A	1	\$750.00	\$1,627.03	\$1,627
95 Mills Act Proc. 1-20 units	5	\$375/unit	\$2,003.61	\$10,018
96 Mills Act Proc. 21-50 units	1	\$275/unit	\$2,183.79	\$2,184
97 Mills Act Proc. 51-100 units	1	\$150/unit	\$2,363.98	\$2,364
98 Mills Act Proc. 101+ units	1	\$100/unit	\$2,544.17	\$2,544
99 Zoning PC	1	\$426,188.00	\$466,907.58	\$466,908
100 Zoning Review of Fence Height	1126	\$0.00	\$154.88	\$174,399
101 Review of plans as Cond of Appvl	1	\$100.00	\$144.11	\$144
102 Insp for Compliance w/ AUP or CUP	1	\$81/year	\$144.11	\$144
103 Spcl Proj. Hourly Rate	1	\$65.00	\$96.07	\$96

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

## PARKS, RECREATION AND MARINE DEPARTMENT

PROGRAM NAME	CURRENT FEE REVENUE	TOTAL FEE & GRANT REVENUE	PROGRAM FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
1 Facility Operations - Supervision		\$297,637	\$1,102,966	\$1,102,966
2 Gym Operations		\$2,660	\$314,133	\$314,133
3 General Park Programs	\$12,225	\$155,056	\$2,835,874	\$2,835,874
4 Youth Field Trips (Unreimbursed)			\$133,056	\$133,056
5 El Dorado Regional Park Operations	\$825,410	\$718,956	\$1,312,624	\$1,312,624
6 Contract Classes	\$777,980	\$786,802	\$1,015,057	\$1,015,057
7 Teen Centers		\$12,800	\$580,088	\$580,088
8 Seniors - General Programs	\$39,006	\$47,345	\$1,091,212	\$1,091,212
9 Seniors - Social Services		\$334	\$50,042	\$50,042
10 Seniors - Retail Activities	\$55,924	\$56,807	\$146,523	\$146,523
11 Seniors - Field Trips (Unreimbursed)			\$48,770	\$48,770
12 Env'tal - Nature Ctr - Staff Class & Prog	\$28,589	\$30,831	\$304,352	\$304,352
13 Env'tal - Retail & Counter Opers	\$28,000	\$28,524	\$69,261	\$69,261
14 Aquatics - Recreational Swimming	\$47,057	\$184,245	\$552,805	\$552,805
15 Aquatics - Lessons	\$34,108	\$49,908	\$130,592	\$130,592
16 Aquatics - Permitted Activities	\$3,135	\$8,489	\$58,313	\$58,313
17 Aquatics - Partner Activities	\$3,135	\$8,423	\$43,575	\$43,575
18 Picnic Sites - Reserved	\$15,261	\$16,458	\$198,668	\$198,668

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

## PARKS, RECREATION AND MARINE DEPARTMENT

PROGRAM NAME	CURRENT FEE REVENUE	TOTAL FEE & GRANT REVENUE	PROGRAM FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
19 Picnic Sites - General Permits		\$526	\$91,899	\$91,899
20 Comm Center - Private Reserv	\$344,979	\$327,337	\$314,860	\$314,860
21 Comm Center - Comm & Partner Res		\$1,053	\$149,096	\$149,096
22 Sports - Permitting - Youth Leagues		\$1,071	\$267,988	\$267,988
23 Sports - Permitting - Adult Lge&Res	\$223,165	\$223,806	\$119,810	\$119,810
24 Sports - General Field Reservations	\$11,746	\$11,874	\$22,942	\$22,942
25 Sports - Permitting - Partner Field Use		\$377	\$87,416	\$87,416
26 Intervention & Prevention	\$10,000	\$12,450	\$217,587	\$217,587
27 Blair Field - Pro Leagues	\$36,076	\$38,142	\$312,471	\$312,471
28 Blair Field - CSULB	\$18,038	\$19,943	\$294,715	\$294,715
29 Blair Field - Youth Leagues	\$6,013	\$6,830	\$117,472	\$117,472
30 Blair Field - Tournaments & Reserv	\$30,064	\$30,292	\$42,523	\$42,523
31 Blair Field - Spec Events & Filming	\$30,064	\$30,438	\$57,961	\$57,961
32 Rancho Los Cerritos - Gen'l Opers		\$2,256	\$417,957	\$417,957
33 Rancho Los Cerritos - Education		\$276	\$58,300	\$58,300
34 Rancho Los Cerritos - Spec Events		\$303	\$76,891	\$76,891
35 Cultural - Homeland - Gen'l Opers		\$1,026	\$216,519	\$216,519
36 Cultural - Homeland - Staff Cl & Prog		\$280	\$56,216	\$56,216

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY

## DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

### PARKS, RECREATION AND MARINE DEPARTMENT

PROGRAM NAME	CURRENT FEE REVENUE	TOTAL FEE & GRANT REVENUE	PROGRAM FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
37 Cultural - Homeland - Spec Events		\$280	\$56,216	\$56,216
38 Cultural - Murals		\$1,079	\$97,996	\$97,996
39 Volunteer Program Coordination		\$340	\$59,316	\$59,316
40 Summer Food Program		\$351,474	\$479,039	\$479,039
41 Adaptive - Staff Classes & Prog	\$27,776	\$29,582	\$252,225	\$252,225
42 Adaptive - Residential Camping	\$4,675	\$4,909	\$43,578	\$43,578
43 Cultural - Municipal Band		\$11,371	\$329,865	\$329,865
44 Sports - Adult Leagues	\$305,715	\$292,750	\$566,927	\$566,927
45 Sports - Midnight Basketball		\$79	\$46,356	\$46,356
46 Sports - Roller Hockey			\$2,355	\$2,355
49 Youth Sports		\$8,510	\$768,610	\$768,610
50 Aquatics - Sailing & Boating - Youth		\$40	\$8,644	\$8,644
51 Aquatics - Sailing & Boating - Adults		\$40	\$8,633	\$8,633
52 Day Camps - Aquatics		\$59	\$12,949	\$12,949
53 Day Camps - Parks	\$286,621	\$295,825	\$941,215	\$941,215
54 Extended Day Care	\$180,864	\$185,171	\$472,152	\$472,152
55 Mobile Recreation		\$2,043	\$142,704	\$142,704
56 Mobile Skatepark		\$37,155	\$104,369	\$104,369

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.

# PRELIMINARY PHASE II FEE STUDY DRAFT REPORT - NOT RECOMMENDATION

## PARKS, RECREATION AND MARINE DEPARTMENT

PROGRAM NAME	CURRENT FEE REVENUE	TOTAL FEE & GRANT REVENUE	PROGRAM FULL COST	ANNUAL FULL COST
57 PAL Programs		\$3,821	\$479,427	\$479,427
58 Youth Job Training	\$40,000	\$41,455	\$116,634	\$116,634
59 Special Events - City Events	\$145,731	\$152,639	\$565,213	\$565,213
60 Special Events - Non-City Events	\$145,775	\$147,691	\$440,823	\$440,823
61 Cultural - Museum of Art		\$2,142	\$575,897	\$575,897
62 Historical - Rancho Los Alamitos			\$438,254	\$438,254
63 Leases & Concessions - Golf	\$4,590,965	\$4,591,998	\$309,127	\$309,127
64 Leases & Concessions - Other	\$140,877	\$141,188	\$115,417	\$115,417

NOTE: Departments are reviewing this draft and are assessing policies for subsidies.